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Reviewer's report:

Overall improvements have been made, however I still have a few queries.

The methodology needs a bit more clarification. The use of 6 questionnaires which are called the 'first questionnaire' etc. is still problematic for a new reader. This applies both to the abstract and main text. Perhaps saying something like, "at each time point (pre training, immediately after and 3 months post training) 6 validated questionnaires were administered in Dutch. The order of administration of the questionnaires remained unchanged throughout the time points'. Or something along these lines. The authors can then go on to explain each questionnaires, providing references to studies which have investigated validity of these questionnaires. In the figures rather than saying first questionnaire etc. it would be more appropriate to say questionnaires- pre training, questionnaire- immediately post training, questionnaires- 3 months post training)

Because it is very difficult to access some of these questionnaires it is difficult to ascertain the appropriateness of these questionnaires. I am concerned about the use of the productivity questionnaire as a majority of subjects in this study were elderly and are unlikely to be in work because they would be retired due to old age and I am therefore not sure how applicable a questionnaire that deals with absenteeism at work would be. This needs to be clarified as I am basing my judgment on the information provided by the authors about the questionnaire.

The methods section suggests that 'about' 180 participants are trained annually and would be eligible. I am concerned about the use of the word 'about'. It is not clear why only 64 started the first stage, presumably the rest declined. But why did they decline? This should be clearly documented as well. Please include this information into Figure 1.

Findings from the study by Bray et al have been incorporated into the introduction but the section does not quite follow and should be rewritten so that it flows well within the text.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Unable to assess

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English
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Needs some language corrections before being published
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